

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT  
Serial No. 10/684,054  
Page 7 of 8**REMARKS**

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 9, 2004. In view of the following discussion, the Applicants believe that all claims are in allowable form.

**RESTRICTION**

The Applicants elect with traverse the invention of Species B, as depicted in Figures 3A and 3B for further prosecution. From Species B, the Applicants identify generic independent claims 1, 21, and 22 (as amended), and dependent claims 2-4, 6, 8-11, 13, and 23 as readable upon Species B. Thus, claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-19, and 21-23 are provisionally elected. Claims 5, 7, 12, and 14-20 are provisionally withdrawn without prejudice.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction does not conform with MPEP §803 which outlines the criteria for making a proper restriction. Specifically, a restriction is proper when an application contains inventions that are independent or distinct as claimed, and that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required. The Examiner is required to provide reasons and/or examples to support his conclusion. The Examiner may provide a prima facie evidence of a serious burden by showing an appropriate explanation either of separate classification, separate status in the art, or a different field of search.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not demonstrated a serious burden in requiring a restriction in the present application. The Examiner has merely identified different species. However, Species G further defines elements already present in the limitations of claims readable on elected Species B. As a field of search targeting heating assemblies and substrate supports of Species B, would encompass the limitations recited by claims to Species G, little, if any, burden is placed upon the Examiner to consider more than solely Species B during her search. Since Species B and G of the present application are a reasonable number of species

327304

PAGE 8/9 \* RCVD AT 1/5/2005 2:21:31 PM [Eastern Standard Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFAXF-1/0 \* DNIS:8729306 \* CSID:732 530 9808 \* DURATION (mm-ss):03-02

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT  
Serial No. 10/684,054  
Page 8 of 8

and no serious burden is place on the Examiner, consideration of all claimed embodiments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.141 and §1.146.

Species B and G are generic to claims 1, 21, and 22. Dependent claims 2-4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-19, and 23 are readable upon Species B and G.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully request claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-19, and 21-23 be considered by the Examiner. Claims 5, 7, 12, 17, and 20 are withdrawn without prejudice. The Applicants reserve the right to file divisional/continuation applications to prosecute the non-elected subject matter.

**CLAIM AMENDMENTS**


The Applicants have amended claims 2 and 14 to correct minor grammatical errors. The Applicants have amended claims 22 and 23 to more clearly recite aspects of the elected species. The Applicants submit that these amendments are not narrowing and were made for reasons unrelated to patentability. The Applicants further submit that no new matter has been added.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, both further consideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited. If, however, the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Keith Taboada at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

*Jan 5, 2005*

  
Keith P. TABOADA, Attorney  
Reg. No. 45,150  
(732) 530-9404

BEST AVAILABLE C

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue  
Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

☐ BLACK BORDERS

☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING

☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING

☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS

☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**